



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,296	04/01/2004	Michelle LaBrosse	CHIEF-0011	7330
23550 7590 12/04/2009 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207			EXAMINER WU, RUTAO	
			ART UNIT 3628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/04/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,296

Applicant(s)

LABROSSE ET AL.

Examiner

ROB WU

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☒ Claim(s) 21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In response filed May 06 2009, the Applicant amended claims 1-3 and 17 and added claim 21. Claims 1-9, 17-21 are pending in the current application.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claim 21 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: claim 21 introduced limitation to which the original restriction was based on.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 21 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 17 recite limitation "and attendance at the even is not limited to invited individuals". The Examiner cannot find support for this limitation in the Applicant's specifications. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-9, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub No 2002/0156787 to Jameson et al in view of U.S. Pub No 2003/0200192 to Bell et al in further view of U.S. Pub No 2002/0128934 to Shaer.

Referring to Claim 1:

A system for integrating event management, the system comprising:

At least one computer device including:

Jameson et al do not expressly disclose

A customer relationship system for managing customer information for customers of an event provider stored in a customer database;

Bell et al disclose a customer database storing information and interest of customers that want to be notified of an event. (Fig 1), [0061]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al to combine the customer database as disclosed by Bell et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the customer database would perform the same functions with the event notifying system of Jameson et al as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Jameson et al disclose an event management system for managing event information for events provided by the event provider stored in an event database; [0061], [0071] and

Jameson et al disclose a marketing system for contacting customers of the event provider using the customer database and the event database,[0079] the marketing system including:

A promotion system for information a group of customers of an event, wherein the event requires payment for an individual to attend and attendance at the event is not limited to invited individuals only, [0071], [0073], and

Jameson et al do not expressly disclose wherein the group of customers is identified as having a possible interest in attending the event using customer information stored in the customer database;

Bell et al disclose a customer database storing customer information and notifying the customer of events based on the customers' interests. (Fig 1), [0061]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al to combine the customer database as disclosed by Bell et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the customer database would perform the same functions with the event notifying system of Jameson et al as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

and

Jameson et al and Bell et al do not expressly disclose a feedback system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event, wherein the feedback is obtained using information contained in the customer database and the event database.

Shaer disclose a feedback system of an event planning system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event, [0196] therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al and Bell et al to combine the feedback system as disclosed by Shaer since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements,

and in the combination the feedback system each element merely would have performed the same function to collect feedback as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable to teach a feedback system of an event planning system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event wherein the feedback is obtained using information contained in the customer database and event database.

Referring to Claim 2:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 1, the at least one computer device further including an accounting system for managing accounting information for each event. (Fig 16, 17, 21, 22)

Referring to Claim 3:

Jameson et al the system of claim 1, the at least one computer device further including a transaction processing system for processing electronic payment for an event, (Fig 21, 22) [0093], [0094]

Referring to Claim 4:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the marketing system further includes an analysis system for analyzing the event. [0116]

Referring to Claim 5:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 1, wherein customers are contacted by at least one of: an e-mail, a newsletter, and a telephone call. [0079]

Referring to Claim 6:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the customer relationship system includes:

An information system for displaying customer information and event information;
(Fig 11-22

A customer management system for allowing a customer to manage the customer information; [0101] and

A provider management system for allowing an event provider to manage the customer information. [0076]

Referring to Claim 7:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the event management system includes:

A configuration system for allowing an event provider to manage the event;
[0075], [0076] and

A registration system for allowing a customer to register for the event. [0095]

Referring to Claim 8:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 7, wherein the event management system further includes a registrant system for providing data on the event to a customer that has registered for the event. [0096], [0097]

Referring to Claim 9:

Jameson et al disclose the system of claim 7, wherein the event management system further includes a security system for limiting access to functionality of the event management system. [0068]

Referring to Claim 17:

A computer program product comprising a computer useable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied therein for integrating event management, the program product comprising:

Jameson et al do not expressly disclose program code configured to manage customer information for customer of an event provider stored in a customer database;

Bell et al disclose a customer database storing information and interest of customers that want to be notified of an event. (Fig 1), [0061]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al to combine the customer database as disclosed by Bell et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the customer database would perform the same functions with the event notifying system of Jameson et al as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Jameson et al disclose program code configured to manage event information for events provided by the event provider stored in an event database; [0061], [0071] and

Jameson et al disclose program code configured to market an event of the event provider to customers of the event provider using the customer database and the event database, wherein the event requires payment for an individual to attend and attendance at the event is not limited to invited individuals only, and wherein the program code configured to market an event includes [0071], [0073], [0079]:

Jameson et al do not expressly disclose program code configured to promote the event to a group of customers using email, wherein the group of customers is identified as having a possible interest in attending the event using customer information stored in the customer database;

Bell et al disclose a customer database storing customer information and notifying the customer of events based on the customers' interests. (Fig 1), [0061]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al to combine the customer database as disclosed by Bell et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the customer database would perform the same functions with the event notifying system of Jameson et al as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

and

Jameson et al and Bell et al do not expressly disclose a feedback system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event, wherein the feedback is obtained using information contained in the customer database and the event database.

Shaer disclose a feedback system of an event planning system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event, [0196] therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al and Bell et al to combine the feedback system as

disclosed by Shaer since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the feedback system each element merely would have performed the same function to collect feedback as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable to teach a feedback system of an event planning system for obtaining feedback from a group of customers that attended the event wherein the feedback is obtained using information contained in the customer database and event database.

Referring to Claim 18:

Jameson et al disclose the computer program product of claim 17, further comprising:

Program code configured to manage accounting information for each event; (Fig 16, 17, 21, 22) and

Program code configured to process payment by a customer for an event. (Fig 21, 22) [0093], [0094]

Referring to Claim 20:

Jameson et al disclose the computer program product of claim 17, wherein the program code configured to manage customer information includes program code configured to allow each customer to manage the customer information for the customer. [0101]

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub No 2002/0153787 to Jameson et al in view of U.S. Pub No 2003/0200192 to Bell et al in further view of U.S. Pub No 2002/0128934 to Shaer in further view of Office Notice.

Referring to Claim 19:

The computer program product of claim 17, wherein the program code configured to manage event information includes:

Jameson et al disclose sending attendee URL links of the event for attendee to register. [0073], [0095]

Jameson et al combined with Bell et al and Shaer do not expressly disclose placing the URL to the event registration on a third party website.

However, the Examiner takes Office Notice that placing links on third party websites, or URL referral service, is old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Jameson et al to allow the event planners to place the URL of the event registration page on a third party website for attendees to access.

Jameson et al disclose program code configured to limit access to even information and management functions based on a security level of a user; [0068]

Program code configured to register a customer for the event using the vent registration web page; [0095] and

Program code configured to provide additional event information to the registered customer. [0096], [0097]

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **ROB WU** whose telephone number is (571)272-3136. The examiner can normally be reached on **Mon-Fri 8-5**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571)272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628